DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 004 RC 015 581

AUTHOR Riley, Gary L.; And Others
TITLE Overview of Student Characteristics and Program Outcomes. HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project. Research Report No. 2.
INSTITUTION California State Univ., Fresno.
SPONS AGENCY California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.; Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Sep 85
NOTE 34p.; For related documents, see RC 015 580-583.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Educational Attainment; Family Characteristics; Higher Education; *High School Equivalency Programs; Longitudinal Studies; *Migrant Adult Education; Migrant Education; *Migrant Programs; Outcomes of Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; *Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS *College Assistance Migrant Program; HEP CAMP National Evaluation Project

ABSTRACT

This research report is a detailed summary of student backgrounds, family characteristics, and educational and career outcomes of the respondents in the 1984-85 High School Equivalency Programs (HEP) and College Assistance for Migrants Programs (CAMP) National Evaluation Project. The report indicates that approximately half the HEP/CAMP participants came from families in the agricultural migrant stream, with over 75% reporting family incomes under $10,000 per year. Only one student in six reported that either parent graduated from high school. Nearly 60% of HEP/CAMP students spoke a language other than English in their homes. Despite the prevalence of "predictors of educational failure," 84.6% of those enrolled in HEP from 1980-1984 passed the General Educational Development examination. Of all CAMP students served between 1980-1984, 92.4% have completed at least the first year of college. About 13% have completed two-year degrees, 15% have completed four-year degrees, and nearly 2% have earned graduate degrees. Currently 28% of the HEP population and 68% of the CAMP population are enrolled in school. Over half of these students are employed part-time, one-third are employed full-time, and the rest are unemployed. Without multiple variable analyses, such as those performed for the comprehensive analytical report (Research Report No. 3), career-outcome findings in this report may seem mixed, unclear, and a bit difficult to interpret. (NEC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JAN 1986
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gary L. Riley
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED265004

HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project
Research Report No. 2

Overview of Student Characteristics and Program Outcomes

Gary L. Riley, Ph.D.
Project Director
and
Assistant Dean for Research
California State University, Fresno
Division of Student Affairs
Fresno, CA 93740

SEPTEMBER, 1985

PC015581

The HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project was funded by the U.S. Department of Education in response to a proposal developed by the National Association of HEP/CAMP Program Directors. The research grant was awarded to the California State Department of Education and was conducted under an Interagency Agreement by personnel at California State University, Fresno in association with a staff of national HEP/CAMP associates. The findings and conclusions contained in this research report are solely those of the Project and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the U.S. Department of Education, the California State Department of Education or the California State University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORT SECTION	PAGE NO.
Evaluation Project Staff and Associates.....	iv
PART ONE: Study Design and Research Methodology....	1
Goals of the National Evaluation Project.....	2
Basic Research Design.....	2
Products of the National Evaluation Project.....	3
Determining Student Outcomes.....	4
Validation of Sample Representation.....	6
PART TWO: Participant Background Characteristics....	8
Personal and Family Background Characteristics....	8
Family Educational Background.....	9
PART THREE: A Summary of Educational Outcomes.....	13
HEP Participant Outcomes.....	13
CAMP Participant Outcomes.....	15
PART FOUR: A Summary of Career Outcomes.....	18
HEP Career Outcomes.....	19
CAMP Career Outcomes.....	21
PART FIVE: Personal, Educational, Career Enhancement	22
Personal Support and Development.....	22
Educational Support and Development.....	24
Career Support and Development.....	27
Section Summary.....	28

PROJECT STAFF AND ASSOCIATES

Arthur L. Campa, Project Field Representative, received his Ph.D. in the field of anthropology from the University of Colorado, Boulder. He has supervised and conducted a variety of evaluative research efforts in Colorado and Wyoming, and has taught university level courses in cultural and linguistic anthropology and ethnic studies.

Bob N. Cage, Coordinator of Field Data Collection, received his Ph.D. in educational research from Iowa State University. He has been the director of over 20 research projects, and has been directly involved with migrant education for over 14 years. Dr. Cage is the author of a statistics textbook and several scholarly articles and monographs.

Raul Z. Diaz, Research Associate, received an M.A. in counseling from the California State University and has since served as a counselor and administrator in migrant education for nine years in school and community organizations. He is currently the President of the HEP CAMP National Association, elected to that position as the Director of the CSUF CAMP program which he has administered since its inception in 1981.

Gary L. Riley, Project Director, received his Ph.D. in higher education administration and organization studies at Stanford University. He has conducted numerous state, regional, and national evaluations and large-scale survey research projects. Dr. Riley has held a variety of university administrative and faculty appointments and is currently Assistant Dean for Research, Planning and Evaluation at California State University, Fresno.

Larry L. Rincones, Project Field Representative, received his M.Ed. in curriculum and instruction from the University of Texas, Austin. He has teaching and administrative experience at the University level, with over seven years experience in HEP/CAMP program planning, development and administration.

Andrew J. Rodarte, Research Associate, received his M.A. in education from the College of Notre Dame in Belmont, California. He has a diverse professional background, having served as a teacher and a dean at the high school level, and as both HEP and Upward Bound director at the University. He is currently a migrant education administrator in an Educational Services District in the State of Washington.

Don Sanders, Project Field Representative, is currently the director of a HEP program at the University of Houston. Since 1967, he has taught at the University and high school levels and has conducted a side variety of evaluative research and innovative educational programs. Dr. Sanders is the author of several scholarly articles and a recently published book.

PART ONE

STUDY DESIGN AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

High School Equivalency Programs (HEP) and College Assistance for Migrants Programs (CAMP) have served approximately 45,000 adult agricultural migrants and seasonally employed farmworker families since the mid-1960's when the United States Congress acknowledged the need for educational programs which would give assistance to an estimated 1.4 million Americans whose migratory employment needs often conflict with their ability to successfully achieve secondary and post-secondary educational objectives. In 1984 the U.S. Department of Education made a decision to fund a national evaluation of HEP and CAMP programs. This evaluation effort would establish a national baseline data set on the characteristics and impact of HEP and CAMP programs upon participants who were enrolled in the programs between 1980 and 1985. It would be the first longitudinal study of Migrant Higher Education outcomes.

A planning committee of the National Association of HEP and CAMP Program Directors developed the research design in consultation with other program administrators and leading educational researchers in the field of migrant education. The study was national in scope, calling for the voluntary participation of 100% of the HEP and CAMP programs that were funded and operating in 1984-85, and that had also been operating one or more years prior to that. Fifteen (15) HEP programs and four (4) CAMP programs met the selection criteria and agreed to participate in the evaluation effort. Programs included in the national sample are representative of all regions of the United States and Puerto Rico that have HEP and CAMP programs. Collectively, the sampled programs also reflect the full diversity of America's agricultural migrant populations.

GOALS OF THE NATIONAL EVALUATION EFFORT

The primary goal of the national evaluation effort was to determine the impact of HEP and CAMP program participation upon the subsequent educational and career achievements of the populations served. When combined with other kinds of participant and program information, the resultant data would also allow the researchers to document definitive program features, establish accurate measures of program achievement, ascertain program features that are associated with differential student outcomes, and provide an exemplar evaluation methodology which could be used effectively by individual programs in their evaluation efforts.

BASIC RESEARCH DESIGN

The study utilized a variety of survey and other data gathering techniques to assemble program and participant information dating back to 1980. Five field representatives were selected from among the HEP/CAMP National Association membership to conduct site visits to each of the sample programs. Field representatives conducted interviews with program staff and students, collected program documents, administered a questionnaire to all program staff members, and assisted each Director in completing a "Project Background Questionnaire."

Additionally, each participating program provided the Field Representative with the names and (most current) addresses of students who were served by the programs between 1980 and 1985. From these lists, a representative sample was selected for each program year and survey questionnaires were distributed by mail from California State University, Fresno's project headquarters. Combined, the data obtained from staff, from program documents, and from the participants represents the most complete set of information ever assembled on HEP and CAMP programs.

PRODUCTS OF THE NATIONAL EVALUATION EFFORT

A total of four written products were produced by the evaluation project. These products include:

A. Research Report No. 1, Overview of Program and Staff Characteristics;

B. Research Report No. 2, Overview of Student Characteristics and Program Outcomes;

C. Research Report No. 3, Analysis of HEP and CAMP Program Impact;

D. Technical Report, A Documented Model of HEP and CAMP Program Evaluation.

Research Reports 1 and 2 contain basic descriptive information on programs, staff, and students obtained from survey questionnaires and project documents. Their primary purpose is to provide participating Project Directors with feedback information that is unique to their own respective programs. This feedback information is only available to the participating projects, allowing each project to compare itself to the averages reported for all HEP and CAMP programs nationally. Research Reports 1 and 2 also provide the general reader with national summaries of HEP and CAMP data obtained from project documents, staff surveys and student questionnaires. Such copies do not include project-specific feedback data in the interest of confidentiality.

Research Report No. 3 is a comprehensive analytical treatment of study findings, with special focus upon determining the accumulative educational and career outcomes of having participated in a HEP or a CAMP program. In addition, measured differences in student outcomes are tested against a variety of specific program features, resulting in a series of policy and program design implications for new and continuing programs.

The fourth product is a Technical Report which is a documented HEP and CAMR program evaluation model based upon the instrumentation and the methodology utilized in the National Evaluation effort. It also suggests how the evaluation model might be adapted to fit the needs of local HEP and CAMP programs. The document consists of a complete set of survey instrumentation, recommendations for data gathering, samples of appropriate statistical procedures, and a set of reporting procedures that are responsive to the information needs of local projects as well as those of the U.S. Department of Education regarding HEP and CAMP Program outcomes.

DETERMINING STUDENT OUTCOMES

The focus of Research Report No. 2 is upon student outcomes and a number of participant characteristics as revealed by a survey of a representative sample of HEP and CAMP program participants enrolled between 1980 and 1985. Questionnaire surveys of agricultural migrants and seasonally employed farmworkers are difficult to administer given the itinerant nature of these populations. The situation becomes even more problematic when attempting to locate individuals who were only enrolled in a program for a short time---and up to five years previous!

Each Project Director was asked to provide researchers with a list of all individuals who were admitted to their respective programs and who were in attendance at least initially. Lists were assembled for the years 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983 and 1984. Where possible, each program listed participants' "current mailing address." If the address on file was not known for certain to be the "current address," then the project provided the "permanent mailing address" as indicated when the student enrolled. The "permanent mailing address" given was usually

that of one's parents or another family member whose residence was likely to be the same as when the student enrolled in the program.

On the questionnaire envelope appeared the message (in Spanish and English) that if the person to whom the envelope was addressed is known to the recipient, "please open this package." Inside was a form asking for the current address of the student and a postage-paid return envelope to be mailed back to the evaluation project. This proved to be effective in obtaining updated addresses for about 10% of the final sample of students who responded to the questionnaire.

The initial survey sample was selected using a weighted formula: 20% of the participants for the years 1984, 1983, and 1982 were mailed questionnaires; 30% of those enrolled in 1981 were sampled; and 40% of the 1980 population were sent questionnaires. This "oversampling" of 1981 and 1980 populations was to better insure a comparable response rate from those years which were likely to be the most difficult to find current mailing addresses. Overall, the returns for 1980 and 1981 were comparable to the more recent program years.

Questionnaires were printed in English for program participants in the United States, and in Spanish for those who participated in Puerto Rico's HEP program. Response rates varied from program to program, and from year to year. The mean response rate was 29%, with some of the program-years exceeding 45% and others falling under 20%. If the response rate dropped below 20% and it was not possible to increase the returns by re-sampling, that particular program-year was dropped from the final analysis. For purposes of this report, however, all responses are included in the program aggregates. Only in Report No. 3 where a "longitudinal analysis of program impact" is discussed was it necessary

to exclude under-represented program-years from the correlational data analyses.

VALIDATION OF SAMPLE REPRESENTATION

An inherent danger in all survey research is that the responding population may be different from those who chose not to respond. Thus the responding population would not accurately represent the "universe" from which the total sample was drawn. If those who respond to a survey questionniare are systematically different from those who chose not to respond, then a non-respondent bias exists. That is, the returns would not accurately reflect the diversity of characteristics known to exist in the total population under study.

By comparing certain demographic characteristics of the responding population to those that are known to exist among the total population under study, an estimate may be made of the extent of non-respondent bias. If, however, the characteristics of the responding population are comparable to those of the total population under study, then it may be reasonably assumed that no bias exists. As indicated in Table 1, the responding population of HEP and CAMP students is very similar to the universe of students served by participating programs. Key characteristics of the individuals served by the programs are comparable to those reported by students who returned the questionnaires.

The data obtained from the student survey are therefore judged to be statistically representative of the universe of HEP and CAMP populations served between 1980 and 1985, and no adjustment is necessary for reasons of non-respondent bias. The quality of the data and the high level of confidence that one may place in the findings are unusual in this regard given the difficulty of tracking migrant populations.

TABLE 1

A Comparison of Characteristics of Survey Respondents and the Universe of HEP/CAMP Populations Served between 1980 and 1985

POPULATION FEATURES	HEP Universe	HEP Returns	CAMP Universe	CAMP Returns
SEX				
% Males	60	56	45	27*
% Females	40	44	55	73*
MARITAL STATUS WHEN ENROLLED				
% Married	20	24	98	99
ETHNICITY				
% Asian American	1	2	1	1
% Black	2	3	2	3
% Hispanic	80	69*	93	92
% Native Amer.	5	9	1	1
% White	12	14	2	3
% Other	1	1	1	0
AGE IN PROGRAM				
% 17 to 20 Years	85	82	89	85
% 21 to 25 Years	12	14	9	13
% 26 to 30 Years	2	3	1	1
% Over 30 Years	1	1	1	1

*Significant differences.

Some differences are found when comparing respondents to those who were actually enrolled in the programs. The proportion of HEP respondents who are Hispanic is slightly less than the proportion who were actually enrolled. And, the proportion of female CAMP students responding is greater than the proportion who were initially enrolled as college freshmen. Sufficient numbers of Hispanic HEP respondents and male CAMP respondents are included in the study population, however, to minimize any possible effects of non-respondent bias.

PART TWO

PARTICIPANT BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

Very little is known from conventional survey research about the families of America's agricultural migrants and seasonally employed farm workers. Most of the information that is available is often assembled as a part of the data gathering and evaluation processes associated with Migrant Education programs and activities in the public school systems (grades Kindergarten through 12) of the nation. Unreached by these in-school efforts are the dependents of agricultural migrants who have dropped out of school and who are no longer the subjects of evaluation and social policy research within the specific context of the American agricultural migrant phenomenon.

Perhaps for the first time on a national scale, survey data are now available on the characteristics of at least two significant agricultural migrant and seasonally-employed dependent sub-populations: those who were unable to complete high school graduation requirements (HEP); and those who successfully completed high school (or its equivalent) and who enrolled as first-time entering freshmen in an institution of higher education (CAMP). Thus, the information obtained through the student survey is not only of value to the national HEP/CAMP program evaluation effort, but also to policy makers and program planners who have often expressed the need for an independent empirical verification of the existence of needs, background characteristics, and educational disadvantages among these populations.

Personal and Family Background Characteristics. Approximately half of the participants in HEP and CAMP programs come from families that are in the "true agricultural migrant stream." Family employment

consists of working on a seasonal basis in at least two geographic areas apart from the family's permanent area of residence. The others are employed on a seasonal basis for two or more farmers in the general area of the family's permanent residence.

HEP and CAMP students are from extremely low-income background families, with over three fourths of the respondents reporting a total combined family income of under $10,000 a year with a mean family size of 8.67 for HEP and 7.28 for CAMP. English was the primary language spoken at home for only about 40% of HEP and CAMP students as they were growing up. The dominant "home language" was Spanish, but a significant number of students first learned a Native American tribal, French-American, or Eastern European dialect prior to first entering the public school system. Only a small percentage of these individuals were given an opportunity to begin school in a "bilingual educational environment," and therefore had to develop English language skills as one of several new developmental learning experiences upon entering Kindergarten or first grade.

Although over three-fourths of the HEP and CAMP participants were born in the United States (Puerto Rico HEP not included), nearly half of their mothers and/or fathers were born elsewhere. That is to say, half of the participants are first-generation American-born; one fourth are second (or later) generation American-born; and one fourth were born outside of the United States (not counting Puerto Rico HEP).

Family Educational Background. Agricultural migrant and seasonal farmworker families fall into the lowest quartile of educational achievement in the United States. As indicated in Table 2, an overwhelming majority of the parents of HEP and CAMP students did not complete a

TABLE 2

Family Educational Backgrounds
of HEP and CAMP Program Participants

	HEP Students	YOUR Students	CAMP Students
PARENTS' EDUCATION			
% Whose Mother Graduated from High School:	15.4		9.4
% Whose Father Graduated from High School:	14.2		3.8
SIBLINGS' EDUCATION			
% With a Brother or Sister Who Graduated High School:	27.9		53.1
% With a Brother or Sister Who Attended Some College:	11.7		21.4
% With a Brother or Sister Who Also Participated in a HEP or a CAMP Program:	7.9		10.2
What is the Completion Rate among Brothers or Sisters Who Enrolled in College:	15.1		21.4

high school education. In addition, even by late 1985 when the survey of HEP and CAMP students was conducted only slightly over one fourth of the HEP students reported having a brother or sister who graduated from high school. (Bear in mind the fact that the mean average age of HEP respondents in 1985 was 24 years, suggesting that out of a family of six other children several should have reached their 18th birthdays and completed 12 years of school.)

Fifty percent of the CAMP students, on the other hand, reported having at least one brother or sister who had graduated high school by the summer of 1985. The level of their parents' education, however, is even lower than that of HEP participants.

Nationwide, about eight percent of the HEP students reported that by 1985 at least one brother or sister had also enrolled in a HEP or a CAMP program. One out of ten CAMP students has a brother or sister who also enrolled in HEP or CAMP. Interestingly, about 15% of all who were surveyed in both programs reported that they were first referred to the program by a family member: brother, sister, or cousin.

While attending some form of postsecondary educational institution is more common for the brothers and sisters of CAMP students than for HEP, the statistics for both groups are significantly lower than national averages for families of comparable size. Only 12 percent of the HEP population have a sibling who has participated in at least one term of postsecondary education (i.e., trade school, vocational school, two year community college, or four year university.) Twenty one percent of the CAMP survey group reported attendance by a brother or sister.

Due to the lack of "statistically comparable, untreated groups," it is impossible to compare the educational backgrounds of HEP and CAMP students to those of other agricultural migrant dependents who did not participate in these programs. Nevertheless, comparisons may be made between the HEP/CAMP populations and other somewhat similar populations that are included in demographic statistics such as those compiled by the Bureau for Educational Statistics, California and Texas Departments of Education, and the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of California, Los Angeles. Examining the enrollment rates in higher education for rural populations, populations from agricultural regions, populations from small schools, and ethnic minorities (particularly those of Hispanic, Mexican-American, and Chicano backgrounds), we conclude that HEP and CAMP eligible populations suffer a

level of higher education deprivation that is three to five times that of other statistically identifiable disadvantaged populations.

There are two distinct reasons for emphasizing these facts in the context of this research report. The first is to merely point out that HEP and CAMP students are members of a population that is perhaps the least well served in contemporary American education. This is not necessarily a criticism of the educational system, but rather points out the difficulty of serving this highly nontraditional population through conventionally structured educational programs and institutions.

The second reason is to call specific attention to the fact that this population is "at severe risk" of failure in achieving conventional educational goals and objectives. Research conducted on the educational achievement patterns among other disadvantaged populations indicates that students from low-income backgrounds, from minority backgrounds, and from families with low levels of parental educational achievement are significantly less likely to complete high school and some college than any others in the educational system. Therefore, when the achievement rates for HEP and CAMP students are examined in the next section of this report, the findings take on even greater positive meaning. As the data will indicate, HEP and CAMP students demonstrate a level of accomplishment that far surpasses expected averages for this population --even to a level that is comparable to or greater than that of other, non-disadvantaged, groups.

PART THREE

A SUMMARY OF EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

A successful HEP participant is one who completes the educational training program, passes the General Educational Development (GED) examination for a certificate of high school equivalency, and pursues additional educational and career objectives as a consequence of these achievements. A successful CAMP student is one who enrolls as a first time entering freshman in a college or university, corrects any existing basic skill deficiencies, makes sufficient academic progress during the first year to continue the following year as a sophomore, and (without benefit of additional program assistance) persists in these endeavors to the point of earning a baccalaureate degree. The rationale for both of these programs is quite basic: given sufficient opportunity to overcome certain educational deficiencies that are often associated with migratory life patterns, HEP and CAMP participants will seek and achieve career and educational options that are comparable to those enjoyed by other young adults of similar interests, aptitudes, and motivation.

HEP Participant Outcomes. Of all who initially enrolled in a HEP program, 81.1% passed the GED and earned a certificate of equivalency while enrolled in the program. In addition, 3.5% of the respondents reported that they have passed the GED since the time that they left the program. Thus, within the broad context of American adult basic education programs, HEP has achieved an almost unprecedented level of GED success: 84.9 percent. Incidentally, these self-reported data are entirely consistent with HEP Program annual performance reports where GED completion rates typically range from 75 to 85 percent. Table 3, following, summarizes these and other student-reported outcome data.

TABLE 3

HEP Program Educational Outcomes
as Reported by Former Project Participants

	YOUR PROGRAM	ALL HEP PROGRAMS
	Percent Respondents	
GED COMPLETION		
Yes, While in Program		81.1
Yes, After Leaving Program		3.5
No, Never Completed the GED		15.4
CURRENT SCHOOL ENROLLMENT		
Not Currently in School		72.0
Trade School		5.9
Community College		7.9
Four-Year College		8.3
Other		4.3
POSTSECONDARY ACHIEVEMENTS		
Completed a 2-Year Degree		5.1
Completed a 4-Year Degree		1.2
Completed Some Graduate Study or Degree		7.5
ULTIMATE EDUCATIONAL GOALS		
None at the Present Time		35.8
To Complete Some College		16.1
To Complete 2-Year Degree		13.0
To Complete 4-Year Degree		13.4
To Complete Graduate Degree		19.7
SPECIFIC EDUCATIONAL PLANS		
No plans or Now In School		44.5
To Obtain Job/Career Training		38.6
To Obtain College Degree		5.9
To Obtain Graduate Degree		11.0
AVERAGE POST-PROGRAM ENROLLMENT		
Mean Average Years Completed (across all HEP Population) in PostSecondary School/College		.89

CAMP Participant Outcomes. One of the more difficult aspects of research on postsecondary educational progress and achievement is the determination of criteria for "success." Today, it is the exceptional student who enters the University as a first time freshmen and emerges four years later from that school with a baccalaureate degree in hand. Closer to contemporary norms is the individual who takes a minimum of five years to complete the baccalaureate degree, having attended two or more schools in the process.

Adding to the complexity of "measuring academic progress" is the fact that American higher education has increasingly focused upon the successful recruitment and admission of historically underrepresented students who, on the average, enter their first year of college with a considerable number of academic deficiencies which must be remediated in the course of completing one's undergraduate education. It is quite possible, for example, for a student to successfully complete a year of full time freshmen study only to learn that s/he lacks sufficient credits counting toward graduation to be classified as a sophomore. Developmental courses that are required of students with tested deficiencies do not usually count toward graduation and, therefore, toward one's class standing. By one standard, such students have not made "satisfactory academic progress." When they return to school the next year, they will continue to have freshman class standing for at least one additional term. By other standards, however, these students have completed a year of full time study, have maintained a grade point average that is necessary to remain in school, and have persisted (i.e., returned for another year of school). Judging "success" is most difficult under the ambiguous conditions posed by these circumstances.

Not all CAMP students enter college with specific skill deficiencies, of course. Almost half of those surveyed entered college with a high school grade point average (GPA) of 2.5 or better. Students in this group are more likely to complete freshman requirements within the first academic year.

In spite of numerous educational background disadvantages that are known to exist among CAMP freshmen and which are unquestionably associated with high attrition rates, 84.9% of those surveyed reported that they completed their first year of college while they were enrolled in CAMP. [Please note that a CAMP student who has not earned sufficient academic credits to return the second year as a sophomore is still eligible to participate in the program. Thus, "success" is not defined as completing all freshman requirements the first year in residence, but is determined by a combination of factors including: maintaining a GPA which allows the student to return with non-probationary standing; the successful completion of a full-time course of study during the year in residence; and, the correction of any basic skill deficiencies that would prevent the student from making satisfactory progress toward completing graduation requirements.]

About eight percent of the students surveyed reported that they did not complete their first-year requirements while enrolled in the CAMP program, but that they later returned to school and completed at least the first year leading to their chosen degree objectives. Thus, a total of 92.4% of all CAMP students surveyed completed the first year of college (whether in a two-year or a four-year degree program). When compared to current attrition averages for first-time entering freshmen, (about 23% in 1984-85) this is an astounding program accomplishment.

TABLE 4

CAMP Program Educational Outcomes
as Reported by Former Project Participants

	YOUR PROGRAM	ALL CAMP PROGRAMS
	Percent Respondents	
FIRST YEAR COMPLETION		
Yes, While in CAMP		84.9
Yes, After CAMP		7.5
No, Never Completed		7.5
CURRENT SCHOOL ENROLLMENT		
Not Currently Enrolled		32.1
Trade/Vocational School		0
Community College		11.3
Four-Year College		52.8
Other		3.8
POSTSECONDARY ACHIEVEMENTS		
Completed Two-Year Degree		13.2
Completed Four-Year Degree		15.1
Completed Graduate Degree		1.9
ULTIMATE EDUCATIONAL GOAL		
None at the Present Time		1.9
To Complete More College		3.8
To Complete 2-Year Degree		7.5
To Complete 4-Year Degree		43.4
To Complete Graduate Degree		43.4
AVERAGE POST-PROGRAM ENROLLMENT		
Mean Average Years Completed (across all CAMP populations) to Date		2.5

Over two-thirds of the CAMP population surveyed have completed a degree objective, have remained enrolled each consecutive year since completing the program, or both. Fifty-six percent report maintaining a grade point average of 2.5 or better, with nearly 20% indicating that they have earned "mostly A's" since completing the CAMP program.

PART FOUR

A SUMARY OF CAREER OUTCOMES

Although both HEP and CAMP programs are vitally concerned with expanding career options and opportunities for their students, the concept "career outcome" holds a different meaning for each program. HEP programs accept as evidence of success the fact that a student who has passed the GED either enters a postsecondary educational experience or develops and pursues new career interests based upon having achieved a higher level of educational preparation. CAMP programs, on the other hand, would probably view a decision to drop out of college to pursue a career opportunity as a sign of program failure. Instead, most CAMP programs are necessarily future-oriented in their treatment of career planning and development among their students. They would be inclined to accept as evidence of success a student's decision to pursue an academic goal that is guided by a set of career plans and interests, but would feel a sense of defeat if the student left school to attempt to implement that career plan without benefit of additional academic preparation.

As illustrated in the previous section of this report, 28% of the HEP population and 68% of the CAMP population are currently enrolled in school. Over half of these students are employed part-time while in school; a third are employed full-time; and the rest are unemployed. For such students, the question of "career outcome" cannot be responsibly answered at this time. For others who are not in school (or who have already completed their educational objectives), it is relevant to inquire into their employment and income situations as influenced perhaps by their academic achievements in HEP or CAMP.

As explained in the introductory sections of this report, a primary purpose of Research Report No. 2 is to provide feedback to Directors of participating programs. The format adopted for this reporting purpose is simply a set of raw frequencies (i.e., percentage breakdowns of each major item without the benefit of control variables). Therefore, the tables containing information about current employment and income status do not separate out the participants who are currently enrolled in school or who for other reasons are not presently seeking career oriented employment. For reasons that are explained in the discussion on page 18, EXTREME CAUTION must be exercised when interpreting these data. Under no circumstances should this information be quoted out of context, for the employment and income values are negatively skewed due to the effects of the responding populations who are not in the labor force and have not attempted to implement career choices as yet.

HEP Career Outcomes. Seventy percent of the HEP participants surveyed indicated that they received career guidance while enrolled in the program. Of those who actually made a career choice at that time, 28% reported that they are "very successful" in that choice; 35% said that they are "somewhat successful;" and 37% indicated that they were "not successful" in that career choice. Only 29% of those surveyed are currently employed full-time, while 53% are unemployed (see Table 5).

About two-thirds of the HEP sample reported personal incomes of less than $6,000 for 1984. Seven percent earned over $10,000 in that same year, with a few reporting incomes over $25,000. While these data are not particularly encouraging, one will recall that they include some who are students, many who are only part-time employed, and several

who are unemployed and not seeking employment at this time. Research Report No. 3 provides a comprehensive analysis of all income data, with special attention to such factors as employment status, year of program graduation, and completion of career-related postsecondary educational preparation.

TABLE 5

Employment and Income Status
of Former HEP and CAMP Program Participants

	HEP PROGRAM	YOUR PROGRAM	CAMP PROGRAM
	Percent Responding		
CURRENT EMPLOYMENT			
Unemployed and...			
Not Seeking Employment	13.4		13.2
Seeking Employment	39.7		16.9
Part-Time Employed	15.7		32.0
Full-Time Employed	29.1		35.8
CAREER GUIDANCE & CHOICES			
% Receiving Career Guidance While Enrolled in Program	70.9		77.4
% Making Career Decision While Enrolled in Program	50.0		73.6
CAREER CHOICE SUCCESS			
No Choice Made	50.0		22.6
Very Successful	14.2		28.3
Somewhat Successful	18.1		32.1
Not Successful	17.9		11.3
1984 PERSONAL INCOME			
Under $6,000	66.1		77.4
$6,000 to $10,000	14.5		15.1
$10,000 to $15,000	4.7		3.8
Over $15,000	1.2		3.8
No Response	13.4		0.0

CAMP Career Outcomes. At the time of the survey, most of the CAMP respondents (70%) were still attending college, and for the most part they have not begun employment in their chosen careers. Still, nearly three-fourths of them reported making a "career choice" while enrolled in CAMP. It is probably safe to assume that "career choices" made by those who are still enrolled in school are largely expressed through one's choice of academic major, field of concentration, and early career explorations. Their high ratings of "success" in those career choices are also probably expressions of success in their career-related fields of study. (Only 30% have completed degrees, yet 60% expressed high to moderate "success" in their career choices.)

There is a higher rate of employment among former CAMP students than among former HEP students, even though a majority of the CAMP respondents are currently enrolled in school. As low-income students, CAMP participants are eligible for College Work Study, and undoubtedly are otherwise employed as well in order to help finanance their higher educations.

Income levels seem to be about the same for CAMP respondents as reported by HEP participants. A larger proportion of CAMP students reported having personal incomes over $15,000 in 1984, however. The higher levels of income are almost certainly those of CAMP respondents who have completed their degrees and have begun to pursue careers on a full-time basis.

In Research Report No. 3, employment and income analyses are reported for several sub-groups of HEP and CAMP populations, thereby allowing comparisons between students and non-students, among others. These analyses provide clarification for many as yet ambiguous findings.

PART FIVE

PERSONAL, EDUCATIONAL AND CAREER ENHANCEMENT

Most of the information thus far presented is objective in nature. Although somewhat influenced by participants' feelings about their respective programs, their responses to questionnaire items dealing with family backgrounds, educational activities, and employment situations are probably quite accurate.

In this section of the Research Report, however, attention turns toward participants' feelings, attitudes, and perceptions regarding their program experiences. Specifically, respondents were asked to offer an opinion about selected program features fitting into one of three service categories: Personal Support and Development; Educational Support and Development; and, Career Support and Development. Experienced program administrators and evaluators recognize that all three of these support categories are essential to student success.

PERSONAL SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT

Students from disadvantaged backgrounds often lack the necessary self-confidence and assertiveness to achieve well in conventional educational environments. Although not always, it may also be the case that one's perceptions of oneself as <u>learner</u> transfer over to one's concept of self as a <u>person</u>. In such cases, it is not unusual to find low levels of educational and career aspiration, a certain reluctance to set high goals for oneself, and a disheartening sense of futility in pursuing career and educational ideals. For agricultural migrant students, high school dropouts, older students, and women from particular cultural and ethnic backgrounds, the need for personal support mechanisms and services is particularly essential to educational and career achievement.

TABLE 6

Participant Ratings of HEP and CAMP
Personal Support and Development Services

KEY
SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree;
D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree;
NO = No Opinion/Prefer Not To Answer

	PROGRAM	SA	A	D	SD	NO
		Percent Responding				
1. Program changed my life in positive ways.	CAMP	37.7	49.1	3.8	0	9.4
	HEP	47.2	39.8	4.3	0	8.7
	YOURS					
2. Program gave me the self-confidence to set high goals.	CAMP	45.3	32.1	13.2	1.9	7.5
	HEP	52.4	33.9	6.3	1.6	5.9
	YOURS					
3. If I chose again, I'd definitely choose to attend Program.	CAMP	77.4	18.9	0	0	3.8
	HEP	70.9	22.4	1.2	1.2	4.3
	YOURS					
4. Program emphasized social skill development (making friends, etc.)	CAMP	64.0	34.0	1.9	0	0
	HEP	54.3	37.0	3.9	.4	4.3
	YOURS					
5. Program emphasized development of cultural identity and respect.	CAMP	64.2	32.1	1.9	0	1.9
	HEP	52.4	36.2	4.3	.4	6.7
	YOURS					
6. Program emphasized development of personal identity, self-worth.	CAMP	50.9	45.3	1.9	0	1.9
	HEP	44.1	44.1	3.1	.8	7.9
	YOURS					
7. Program staff were sympathetic and understanding of my problems.	CAMP	69.8	26.4	1.9	0	1.9
	HEP	68.1	24.8	1.6	1.6	3.9
	YOURS					
8. Program made me feel that I "really belonged" here.	CAMP	58.5	35.8	1.9	0	3.8
	HEP	55.1	35.8	1.2	1.6	6.3
	YOURS					
9. My family was very supportive of decision to participate.	CAMP	64.2	32.1	1.9	0	1.9
	HEP	65.4	23.6	2.8	1.2	7.1
	YOURS					

Overwhelmingly, participants expressed strong positive opinions regarding the personal support and developmental assistance available to them as HEP and CAMP students. Scanning the data in Table 6, it is clear that students felt a strong sense of support and understanding from program staff and from family members.

Interestingly, students expressed some reservations concerning the impact of program participation upon strengthening "self-confidence" as needed in setting high personal goals. Although the overall ratings in both HEP and CAMP programs are quite positive in this regard, those responding negatively serve as yet another reminder that HEP/CAMP students may require a great deal of compensating personal support to help them overcome the lack of self-confidence that often typifies this learner population. Program Directors might well consider conducting pre- and post-assessments of such attitudes as a part of their regular evaluation plans.

EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT

Even in conventional educational environments, learning achievement is often dependent upon a complex set of conditions including motivation and incentives, learner competencies in fundamental skills, and attitudes and values regarding the learning process and its outcomes. Not everyone learns in the same way, of course. But without the basic skills, incentives, and values it is unlikely that any learner will invest of oneself in the educational process.

Education, therefore, is a continuing developmental process which may begin in a school or program situation, but which is ultimately left to the individual learner to pursue (or reject) as an adopted pattern of lifelong behaviors. Early indicators of one's readiness to adopt these

patterns of behavior are sometimes found among pre-school children. Others may not manifest these readiness behaviors until well along into their adult years.

Although it cannot be determined from the limited information that is available through the HEP/CAMP student survey, one might speculate that at the time they entered the program a majority of HEP students and at least a significant portion of the CAMP population had not yet acquired all of the fundamental skills, incentives, and attitudes (values) that are characteristic of "developmentally mature learners." Survey data do, however, allow us to test in part the extent to which programs provided the necessary developmental opportunities and educational supports to foster these attributes among participants. [NOTE that Research Report No. 3 contains a detailed analysis of the association between long-ranged educational outcomes and learner dispositions as reported in Table 7, following.]

Table 7 reveals that most HEP and CAMP participants found a high level of educational support in their respective programs. Student data suggest that programs placed high emphasis on basic skill achievement, on developing scholarly and related attitudes, and on the development of study skills. Respondents generally agreed that their programs were instrumental in helping them to achieve their educational goals.

Attention may be directed to the CAMP participants' ratings of the extent to which "without the program I never would have been able to achieve my educational goals" (Item 1, Table 7). Nearly a third of the respondents denied that the program was "indispensible" in this regard. As explored in Research Report No. 3, these students may have entered the program with a high pre-disposition toward learning and education.

TABLE 7

Participant Ratings of HEP and CAMP
Educational Support and Development Services

KEY
SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree;
D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree;
NO = No Opinion/Prefer Not To Answer

	PROGRAM	SA	A	D	SD	NO
		Percent Responding				
1. Without the program I'd never have been able to achieve education goal	CAMP	28.3	34.0	22.6	7.5	7.5
	HEP	41.3	37.4	6.7	3.5	11.0
	YOURS					
2. Program emphasized scholarly qualities, and the love of learning.	CAMP	52.8	39.6	5.7	0	1.9
	HEP	51.6	38.2	2.0	.8	7.5
	YOURS					
3. Program emphasized analytical skills, logic, and reasoning ability.	CAMP	32.1	56.6	5.7	0	5.7
	HEP	35.8	47.6	4.3	0	12.2
	YOURS					
4. Program emphasized creative and expressive qualities, self-expression	CAMP	37.7	49.1	7.5	0	5.7
	HEP	22.8	46.5	12.6	.4	17.7
	YOURS					
5. Program emphasized learning things of much practical value	CAMP	30.2	58.5	7.5	0	3.8
	HEP	39.8	48.4	3.1	.8	7.9
	YOURS					
6. Program helped me develop good learning (study) skills	CAMP	49.1	34.0	5.7	0	11.3
	HEP	42.9	41.7	5.5	1.6	8.3
	YOURS					
7. Program helped me develop good reading skills	CAMP	45.3	37.7	5.7	1.9	9.4
	HEP	42.5	43.3	7.9	1.2	5.1
	YOURS					
8. Program helped me develop good writing skills	CAMP	41.5	39.6	11.3	0	7.5
	HEP	37.0	44.5	8.3	2.0	8.3
	YOURS					
9. Program helped me develop good math skills	CAMP	35.8	43.4	9.4	1.9	9.4
	HEP	40.9	40.2	7.9	1.2	9.8
	YOURS					
10. When I needed academic help, staff were there for me	CAMP	67.9	30.2	0	0	1.9
	HEP	68.9	23.2	1.6	1.2	5.1
	YOURS					

CAREER SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT

HEP and CAMP programs are not vocational preparation programs in the ordinary sense. Little if any emphasis is placed in either program upon work experience as a structured part of career development. Job-related skills as may be acquired in these programs are essentially academic skills (i.e., communication, computation, problem-solving) that have applications in virtually all career choices.

Nevertheless, both programs are based upon a concept of career development that emphasizes the relationship between academic achievement and the development of career options. Thus, a HEP student's decision to enroll in a postsecondary educational program upon passing the GED is viewed at least in part as a career-related decision. When a CAMP student declares an academic major, this may be viewed as an important step toward developing a career objective.

TABLE 8

Participant Ratings of HEP and CAMP
Career Support and Development Services

KEY
SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree;
D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree;
NO = No Opinion/Prefer Not To Answer

	PROGRAM	SA	A	D	SD	NO
		Percent Responding				
1. Without the program I'd never have been able to achieve my career goal	CAMP	22.6	39.6	26.4	1.9	9.4
	HEP	26.8	34.6	9.8	2.8	26.0
	YOURS					
2. Program emphasized developing occupational & vocational competency	CAMP	35.8	43.4	11.3	0	9.4
	HEP	45.3	35.8	5.5	1.2	12.2
	YOURS					

As indicated in Table 8, both HEP and CAMP students expressed uncertainty regarding program roles in enabling them to achieve career goals. In part, this uncertainty may be explained by the fact that a large number of students had not made final career choices and had not yet begun to pursue full-time career options at the time that the survey was conducted. (NOTE the large number of "No Opinion" responses to Item 1, Table 8.)

Yet, over three-fourths of those surveyed indicated that programs emphasized the development of occupational and vocational competencies ("skills needed to help me get a good job, to help me get ahead"). It appears that both HEP and CAMP programs include a sufficient amount of "applied curriculum and instruction" to yield student agreement that it has/will have use to them in pursuit of their career objectives.

Research Report No. 3 will examine any differences found in the career support ratings of participants who have already begun fulltime career employment following completion of their educational objectives and those of students who are still in the process of completing their educations.

SECTION SUMMARY

Based upon participant ratings found in Tables 6 through 8, it is apparent that both HEP and CAMP programs place greatest emphasis on Personal Support and Development Services. Readers will recall from Research Report No. 1 that other indicators of program emphasis also suggested that the greatest concentration of program focus was upon support services. Athough generally quite positive in their ratings of Educational Support and Development, the respondents expressed less agreement that their program participation resulted in achieving desired

levels of basic skill mastery--especially in math and writing. For many of the reasons discussed previously, students often lack strong writing and math skills at the time of program entry in both HEP and CAMP. A great deal of progress may be demonstrated during the course of one's project participation, yet still leave the student feeling somewhat skill deficient in these areas.

Much of the discussion regarding career development, employment and income outcomes is left somewhat ambiguous in this report. Without benefit of multiple variable analyses such as those performed for the comprehensive analytical report, Research Report No. 3, career-outcome findings shown in this current report may seem mixed, unclear, and a bit difficult to interpret. Readers are urged to study Report No. 3 in detail before drawing any final conclusions about the career development aspects of HEP and CAMP program participation.